

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION**

**JAMES SCOTT BRADY,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**U.S. GOVERNMENT VETERANS  
ADMINISTRATION,**

**Defendant.**

**Case No. 2:25-cv-211**

**Judge Edmund A. Sargus, Jr.**

**Magistrate Judge Elizabeth P. Deavers**

**ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on a Report and Recommendation filed by the Magistrate Judge on July 7, 2025. (ECF No. 3.) On March 6, 2025, Plaintiff James Brady filed a Complaint against Defendant U.S. Government Veterans Administration, claiming that Defendant “illegally seized” \$25,000 by an illegal lien. (ECF No. 1, PageID 3, 6.) On June 6, 2025, the Magistrate Judge ordered Plaintiff to show cause within 21 days as to why this action should not be dismissed for failure to effect service on Defendant, because the record does not show completed service. (ECF No. 2, PageID 14.) In that June 6 show cause order, the Magistrate Judge cautioned Plaintiff that failure to comply with the order may result in dismissal of the action. (*Id.*) Plaintiff did not respond, and no record of service is shown on the docket.

On July 7, 2025, the Magistrate Judge found that Plaintiff failed to comply with the show cause order and recommended that the Court dismiss Plaintiff’s claims without prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) for failure to comply with the order and for failure to effectuate service. (ECF No. 3, PageID 16.)

Once a magistrate judge issues a report and recommendation, the relevant statute provides:

Within fourteen days after being served with a copy, any party may serve and file

written objections to such proposed findings and recommendations as provided by rules of court. A judge of the court shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.

28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The failure to file written objections to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation waives a *de novo* determination by the district court of any issues addressed in the report and recommendation. *Thomas v. Arn*, 728 F.2d 813 (6th Cir. 1984), *aff'd*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *see also United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947, 949–50 (6th Cir. 1981).

Plaintiff was advised of his right to object to the Report and Recommendation and of the consequences of failing to do so. (ECF No. 3, PageID 16–17.) Plaintiff did not object to the Report and Recommendation.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** and **AFFIRMS** the Report and Recommendation and **DISMISSES without prejudice** Plaintiff's claims against Defendant U.S. Government Veterans Administration. The Clerk is **DIRECTED** to enter judgment, to close this case on the Court's docket, and to mail a copy of this Order to Plaintiff at 9180 Hwy J, Sullivan, MO 63080.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8/5/2025  
**DATE**

s/Edmund A. Sargus, Jr.  
**EDMUND A. SARGUS, JR.**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**